



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,034	05/02/2007	Robert Bucki	46406-0109-01US [222641]	9154
23973	7590	03/03/2010	EXAMINER	
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH			DEVI, SARVAMANGALA J N	
ATTN: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP				
ONE LOGAN SQUARE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
18TH AND CHERRY STREETS				1645
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-6996				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/03/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/574,034	BUCKI ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
S. Devi, Ph.D.	1645	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) S. Devi (PTO). (3) _____.
 (2) Attorney Rocque El-Hayek. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 February 2010

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: *Applicants' amendment filed 03/27/06.*

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

New claim 40

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Attorney El-Hayek was informed of the difficulty in making sense out of the new claim 40, which appears to be an incomplete dependent claim because of the limitation 'method of claim' in line 1. A request was made to file a supplemental preliminary amendment to correct the problem so that a proper search covering the full scope of the claim(s) can be made. Attorney El-Hayek assured the examiner of record that he would file such an amendment shortly.

/S. Devi/
Primary Examiner
AU 1645

02-19-2010